

CAG Meeting Minutes

Subject: West Valley Community Advisory Group (WV CAG) Meeting #4
 I-10 and I-15 Corridor Projects, San Bernardino County

Date: October 17, 2013 at 6:00 PM

Location: Victoria Gardens Main Offices, Rancho Cucamonga, CA

Participants: A total of 13 CAG Members participated in the meeting.

WV CAG Members in Attendance	Organization
Johnson Bobi	Representative of Assemblymember Chris Holden
Lina Chu	Asian Real Estate Association of America (AREAA)
Phillip Cothran	Cothran Insurance Agency Inc.
Dennis Gutierrez	Inland Empire
Michael (Mike) James	Ceramic Tile Contractor
Jonnie Long	Retired, Inland Empire resident for 65 years
Roy Mabry	Association of Black Correctional Workers (ABCW)
Linda Sargent	ThorneSarge Consulting
Matthew Slowik	Retired - Land Use Services Department, San Bernardino County
Luis Vaquera	Fontana Unified School District
William Waddingham	Rotolo Chevrolet
Other CAG Members in Attendance (non-WV CAG)	Organization
Valerie Henry (EV CAG Member)	Devore Rural Protection Association (DRPA)
Thomas Kerman (HD CAG Member)	Hesperia Teacher Association
WV CAG Members not in Attendance	Organization
Dr. Kenneth Alpern (Attended HD CAG meeting)	The Transit Coalition
Michael P. Biagi	California Polytechnic, Pomona
David Buxbaum	Buxbaum & Chakmak
Jeff Caldwell	ATU Local 1704
Lynda Gonzalez	M.A.S. Auto & Truck Electric Corp.
John Heimann	Building Industry Association
Beth Kranda	Valley Transportation Services (VTrans)
Michael Krouse	Ontario Convention Center and Visitors Bureau
Toni Levyssohn	Community Senior Services
Danny Marquez	SB County Veterans Advisory Board / Veterans Partnering with Communities
Christine C. Pham	Victoria Gardens
Faiz Shah	Islamic Center
Marie E. Shahani	Fontana Community Senior Center
Dr. D. C. Nosakhere Thomas	Rainbow Community Praise Center
Other (non-CAG Members)	Organization
Srikanth Konerv	Parsons Brinkerhoff
Arnold San Miguel	SCAG

Monique Molina	Analyst, City of Fontana
Manuel Ornelas	City of Upland
Virrant Sanghai	Parsons Brinkerhoff
Heinrich D. Stydom	Pastor, Seventh Day Adventist Church
San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) and Consultants	
Garry Cohoe	Director of Project Delivery, SANBAG
John Meier	Parsons
Nancy Pfeffer	Network Public Affairs
Cissy Kulakowski	CDM Smith
Craig Hoshijima	PFM
Jason Lombard	Lee Andrews Group, Inc.
Annette Cortez	Lee Andrews Group, Inc.
Tito Corona	Lee Andrews Group, Inc.

I. Welcome

CAG Members were greeted by Jason Lombard, Lee Andrews Group.

II. CAG Member Reports

Mr. Jason Lombard asked the CAG members for reports and any feedback received from their efforts in disseminating project information. Below is a brief overview of the information reported by the members:

- Dennis Gutierrez reported that he has received an overall positive response, that people like the LA Express Lanes and the efficiency of its implementation. Many of the people he has spoken to have already purchased transponders.
- Valerie Henry reported that most of the people she has spoken with have positive attitudes about Express Lanes.
- Jonnie Long reported that she attended a tax seminar and found that the group was well aware of the proposed Express Lanes project. She also had discussion with some friends that weren't happy with the areas where the lanes changed from one to two lanes. (*Note: the updated I-10 Express Lanes Alternative eliminates the two-to-one lane drop between Sierra and I-215*).
- William Waddingham reported that he had discussions with people in Fontana and many are open to the idea of express lanes and like the idea of being able to use the transponder on all US express lane systems.
- Lina Chu reported that she's heard mixed opinions about the monthly maintenance fee. The concern is that this fee will increase in the future. The mixed feeling from some is that the carpool feature will be eliminated but she's told them that the lanes are staying but just changing to express lanes.
- Matthew Slowik reported that Fontana residents are more involved in the three transportation projects currently under construction in the area. The perspective may be that the circulation capabilities will be more known when the current projects are completed to evaluate the need for express lanes.
- Luis Vaquera reported that people he's spoken to are in favor of any traffic improvements but like Matthew Slowik said, the timing is important. People are familiar with existing construction projects.
- Valerie Henry reported that she referred people to the project website for more information.

PowerPoint Presentation – Following the CAG Member reports, the remaining agenda items were discussed with the use of a PowerPoint presentation (a hard copy of the presentation was given to each of the CAG Members), which included the following discussion topics outlined in the sections below.

III. SANBAG Board Updates – Presented by Garry Cohoe, SANBAG

Mr. Cohoe provided an update of the recent SANBAG Board Workshop (10/10/13). Mr. Cohoe explained to the CAG members that the team would be presenting the Express Lanes Studies Findings as they were presented at the Board Workshop on October 10, 2013.

Mr. Cohoe began by providing the group with a recap of the project. His summary included the following items:

- I-10 & I-15 Corridor Project boundaries
- I-10 & I-15 Corridor Project challenges
- SR-91 Eastbound video (recorded on May 3, 2013 at 5:15pm)
- A list of recent Board presentations
- A map showing Express Lanes in the US
- A map showing the location of current Express Lane accounts

The CAG members did not have any questions on the Board Update presentation.

IV. I-10& I15 Project Information – Design – Presented by John Meier, Parsons

Mr. Meier provided an overview of the Project's Information including the three project alternatives being studied for the I-10 Corridor and the two project alternatives being considered for the I-15 Corridor. Mr. Meier's presentation included maps identifying project limits, ingress and egress locations and schedules for the I-10 & I-15 Corridors (Environmental through End of Construction).

I-10 Alternatives

- Alternative 1: No Build
- Alternative 2: HOV Lane Alternative - One High Occupancy Vehicle Lane (HOV) in Each Direction
- Alternative 3: Express Lanes Alternative - Two Express Lanes in Each Direction

Mr. Meier indicated that the revised I-10 Express Lanes Alternative would utilize the original configuration of two Express Lanes from the Los Angeles/San Bernardino county line to SR-210, and one Express Lane from SR-210 to Ford Street in Redlands.

I-15 Alternatives

- Alternative 1: No Build
- Alternative 2: Two Express Lanes in Each Direction

The revised Express Lanes Alternative for I-15 would maintain two Express Lanes from SR-60 to US-395, except between Sierra Avenue and the Devore interchange where it would be reduced from two Express Lanes to one.

The following questions were asked at the end of Mr. Meier's presentation:

- Mathew Slowik: The EIR for the CALNEV Pipeline was recently prepared by Land Use Service in SB County and information reported on the report would probably be useful for the northern part of segment 3 and part of segment 4 of the I-10 Corridor Project.
- Mike James: Are the proposed auxiliary lanes the existing ones? *Garry Cohoe: Some of those will be new and some are existing.*
- Mike James: Are the costs for direct overpass exits being considered? *John Meier: The direct overpass exits (drop ramps) that were evaluated at Beech and Alder are not cost effective and have been withdrawn from further evaluation.*
- Lina Chu: I heard there will be some general purpose lanes being taking away for this project? *John Meier: No. Federal law prohibits the conversion of existing general purpose lanes to Express Lanes. However, the existing HOV lane from the LA County line to Haven will have an additional lane added and the two lanes will be operated as Express Lanes.*

V. Public Outreach – Presented by Jason Lombard, Lee Andrews Group

Mr. Lombard of the Lee Andrews Group, SANBAG’s Outreach Consultants, briefly discussed the Public Outreach Activities. Public outreach for I-10 and I-15 is categorized by Conventional, “Real Time” and CEQA/NEPA outreach.

Mr. Lombard restated the objectives of the CAGs:

- Provide project staff with input
- Convey unbiased information to stakeholder groups
- Encourage community participation

Mr. Lombard’s presentation also included a review of the briefings and canvassing conducted throughout the project corridors. He reported that the team has conducted 63 briefings and visited 641 sites. In total 704 stakeholder groups have been briefed and provided project information

The following questions were asked at the end of Mr. Lombard’s presentation:

- Matthew Slowik: Are the canvassing sites already chosen and not up for input? I think the Jesse Turner center is the heart of the community to go and provide information. *Jason Lombard: The Outreach Team welcomes additional input with regards to briefings and canvassing sites; please provide stakeholder information to our Outreach Team.*
- William Waddingham: For folks in Fontana or close to Fontana, if you’d like to see a presentation by Garry Cohoe, he will be presenting at our Rotary Club Meeting at noon on Monday, October 21, 2013 at Sizzler, 9860 Sierra Ave. Fontana.
- Luis Vaquera: Do you have a list of the places canvassed so I can see what other places we can go to. Jesse Turner Center in North Fontana was mentioned but there are other places to look at. *Jason Lombard: Yes, the list is available upon request.*

VI. Equity Study – Presented by Nancy Pfeffer, Network Public Affairs

Ms. Pfeffer began her presentation by stating that it is best to study equity early in the process. She began her presentation by stating the goals of the Equity Assessment:

- Identify fairness issues and devise solutions
- Address elected official’ and residents’ concerns and perceptions

Ms. Pfeffer continued by presenting literature findings in over 40 papers and reports and also discussed key questions suggested by the literature review.

Literature Findings:

- Express Lane usage is optional
- Opinions improve with experience
- Surveys find users and supporters across all income levels
- Projects that increase the choices available to travelers are helpful to low-income residents

Key Questions:

- Who is affected, whether positively or negatively?
- Who makes direct payments?
- How will project revenues be spent?
- What project benefits and impacts will be experienced?
- Are there viable travel alternatives?

Ms. Pfeffer reviewed the elements of the equity assessment which were based on the following:

- Demographic data for affected area
- Project finance plans
- Value of time
- Time savings in general purpose lanes
- Transponder issues
- Review of transit service (travel alternatives)
- Interviews with both San Bernardino County Stakeholders and experts in toll and equity.

Ms. Pfeffer illustrated the San Bernardino County demographic data along the I-10 and I-15 corridors, and the household income survey results in relation to peak work trips and all trip types. Ms. Pfeffer presented the equity findings and the project financial plans which identified the following sources:

- Toll is paid by user for specific benefit
- Gas tax may be paid by non-users of I-10 & I-15 toll lanes
- Sales tax may be paid by non-users

The overview of the funding sources was as follows:

- Toll revenue - To be used to pay back bonds and TIFIA loan
- SANBAG Measure I funds (42% of I-10 funding and 4% of I-15 funding)
- State and Federal Funds

Ms. Pfeffer presented the Value of Time (VOT) savings as an indicator as to whether drivers would choose Express Lanes which showed that some low-income drivers could choose to use the Express Lanes when the toll fell within their value of time. Ms. Pfeffer presented the overall projected I-10 and I-15 travel time savings, and indicated that the projected time savings shows that general purpose lanes are predicted to be less congested with Express Lanes than without them, increasing travel time savings to both Express Lanes users and General Purpose lanes users.

Next Ms. Pfeffer presented the transponder options with the Express Lanes and the issues identified with each:

- Transponder deposit and account maintenance costs can be burdensome for low-income households.
- Video license plate recognition for toll collection would be helpful to low-income residents but would increase operating costs for SANBAG.

Ms. Pfeffer provided a brief example on elements of the Los Angeles Metro Express Lanes equity program which included the following:

- initial account credit, which may be used for transponder deposit or tolls; and
- account maintenance fee waived permanently on equity accounts

Ms. Pfeffer presented the following “next steps”:

- Peer review of draft Equity Study report
- Refining equity recommendations for SANBAG
- Providing the final report to the SANBAG Board in November 2013.

The following questions were asked at the end of Ms. Pfeffer’s presentation:

- Linda Sargent: I have a question on the transponders, I heard in Florida they use video recognition but heard it’s not working well but my husband has a transponder that he can take from one vehicle to another and I feel that works better. *Garry Cohoe: Vehicle recognition technology has improved significantly over time, and is now considered to be more than 98% accurate. Regarding transponder use, transponders are anticipated to be transferrable between vehicles that are registered to the user’s account. Providing both options will provide corridor users with more flexibility.*
- Matthew Slowik: On the travel options slide, did you say the options are realistic or unrealistic? *Nancy Pfeffer: The use of the travel options listed on page 24 of the presentation would depend on an individual’s origin and destination. It is worth noting that by providing a reliable travel time on the mainline corridor, Express Lanes can facilitate the development of mass transit options such as bus rapid transit (BRT).*
- Matthew Slowik: Currently there aren’t transit systems that travel on the project corridors. *Garry Cohoe: We’ve talked to transit and they’ve expressed interest to have routes down the freeway if they can use the express lanes.*
- Luis Vaquera: On transponder costs and costs per use, I don’t know about the need for a monthly fee. I don’t want to pay a monthly fee to just use once in a while. *Garry Cohoe: The monthly fee is required to account for administrative and transponder maintenance costs. Secondly, since the transponders can be used statewide and in the near future nationwide, if a monthly fee was not charged, motorists from other regions would open up accounts to save the monthly fee. We would have the expense of administrating the account while receiving no revenue.*

- Luis Vaquera: With the express lanes on the 91, there's only one entrance and one exit, here you show multiple points in and out. Would I pay the same if I go in and stay halfway, do I pay for the whole trip or what I use?
Garry Cohoe: Tolls will be based on the portion of the corridor that you use.

VII. Traffic & Revenue Study Results, Presented by Cissy Kulakowski, CDM Smith

Ms. Kulakowski began her presentation by stating the goals of the Traffic & Revenue Study Process.

- Forecast traffic and toll revenue as input to financial feasibility analysis of constructing Express Lanes on I-10 and I-15.
- Develop models that can be used to test and improve traffic operations at access areas.

Ms. Kulakowski illustrated the process used in the study. The detailed process had multiple areas of data collection and model development that generated the output.

- Data Collection: Traffic Counts, Vehicle Class and Occupancy Counts, Travel Time Surveys.
- SCAG Regional Model: Travel Patterns and Corridor Growth.
- VISSIM Simulation Model: Sensitivity of speed/travel time to variations in shift to express lanes.
- Market Share Model: Trip Tables by: SOV, HOV2, HOV3+, AM Peak, AM Shoulder, Midday, PM Peak, PM Shoulder and Night.
- Economic Review: looked and adjusted the growth inherent within the San Bernardino Transportation Analysis Model (SBTAM) model.
- Output: Toll rate sensitivity, Traffic in Express Lanes, Toll revenue by segment, Speed and time savings by segment.
- Stated Preference Surveys: Willingness to pay tolls (Value of Time).

Ms. Kulakowski presented a graph curve generated by responses to the Stated Preference Survey from the 3,400 drivers surveyed. The graph illustrated the following:

- Approximately 7 percent of drivers have a value of time equal to \$10 per hour.
- Average value of time was \$13.60 per hour.
- A small group of drivers are willing to pay any amount to use Express Lanes almost under any circumstance.

Next Ms. Kulakowski discussed the Traffic and Revenue Market Share Model and illustrated a snapshot of the traffic model that covered the entire I-10 and I-15 Corridors as well as parallel roads on either side. The model splits traffic data into six vehicle occupancy and class categories, and analyzed traffic on an hourly basis.

- The project configuration was coded to a high level of detail (number of lanes and access points)
- Tested different tolling structures
- Tested range of toll rates

Ms. Kulakowski showed a graph model designed to recognize the sensitive equilibrium between usage of the Express Lanes and the speed in the general purpose lanes, manifested as travel time savings. At the start of the model, when the Express Lanes are empty, travel time in the general purpose lanes are the lowest and there is a very high time savings. This causes a lot of traffic to shift into the express lanes. If that much traffic shifted into the express lanes, the speeds in the general purpose lanes would improve. With higher speeds, less traffic would use the Express Lanes, altering the time savings. The model goes back and forth, shifting traffic back and forth until the amount of time savings is balanced against the cost of the toll.

Ms. Kulakowski presented the average daily traffic trends on the I-10 and I-15 Corridors.

I-10 Corridor

- East end showed higher growth rates, eventually reaching levels which would be almost as high as the West end.

I-15 Corridor

- Higher growth in general with the South end slightly lower than the growth in the North end.

Ms. Kulakowski also presented samples of the projected toll rate for both the I-10 and I-15 Express Lanes.

I-10 Corridor

- PM Peak Eastbound cost per minute saved is \$0.35
- Total cost for a Through Trip is \$7.15

I-15 Corridor

- PM Peak Eastbound cost per minute saved is \$0.35
- Total cost for a Through Trip is \$15.02 (the cost is more than the I-10 because it has higher traffic volume)

Higher rates would be needed to manage the demand to maintain free flow through the Cajon Pass given the projected longer term growth in the North end of the corridor. The tolls are set to manage traffic movement and toll rates increase as traffic congestion increases.

Ms. Kulakowski concluded her presentation by comparing the toll rates and revenues for the I-10 and I-15 Corridor Projects against 8 existing projects. The revenues for the existing projects were from 2012 while the revenue from the I-10 and I-15 Corridor Projects is the 2035 forecast. The comparison chart showed that the forecasted revenue for the I-10 and I-15 Corridor Projects are higher than what some projects are earning today.

The following questions were asked at the end of Ms. Kulakowski's presentation:

- Valerie Henry: Back on average traffic trends on the I-15 slide, it says Cajon Blvd., is that Cleghorn?
Cissy Kulakowski: Yes
- Matthew Slowik: I know we're between two studies. A number of slides indicate 2012 dollars but reflects 2030, so does your presentation reflect those numbers? *Cissy Kulakowski: Future projections are converted to present dollars (2012) for comparison purposes.*
- Luis Vaquera: Is the cost of the project in today's dollars? *Garry Cohoe: The figures in Craig's presentation are in escalated dollars.*

VIII. Financial Analysis Results, Presented by Craig Hoshijima, PFM

Mr. Hoshijima began his presentation stating key findings:

- I-10 & I-15 are financially feasible
- Cushion for a downside scenario
- Public finance superior to a P3 delivery model

Mr. Hoshijima provided the financial strategy options for the Project which included 2 options:

- Public finance strategy
- Private finance strategy

Mr. Hoshijima presented the steps towards determining financial viability which include:

- Preparing financial plans
- Identifying available funding in a 10-year plan
- Comparing SANBAG and P3 Financing plans

He then illustrated the flow of funds model which occurred in the following sequence:

- Toll revenue plus fees and penalties
- Less: O&M expenses
- Net Revenue
- Plus: Bond reserve and debt service fund interest
- Less: Toll revenue bond debt service
- Less: Debt service reserve fund deposits
- Less: TIFIA debt service
- Less: R&R deposits
- Less: Repayment of sales tax contributions
- Residual Cash Flows (to SANBAG)

Mr. Hoshijima next presented the public funding assumption model which highlighted the following:

- Toll debt paid solely from toll revenues
- Toll debt includes tax-exempt bonds and federal TIFIA loan
- Interest rate on debt based on 10-year historical average
- Amount of debt is limited by minimum “debt service coverage”

Mr. Hoshijima briefly discussed the results of the public financing model and followed by showing the sensitivity analysis on the I-10 and I-15 respectively which highlighted the debt services and the projected net revenues. Mr. Hoshijima followed this by presenting the P3 assumptions which were:

- Concessionaire toll debt paid solely from toll revenues
- Toll debt includes private activity bonds and federal TIFIA loan
- Interest rate on debt based on 10-year historical average
- Amount of debt is limited by minimum “debt service coverage”
- Developer receives a return on equity investment, accounting for depreciation deductions and income tax payments
- Revenue sharing to SANBAG after payment to the developer

Next Mr. Hoshijima presented the P3 Financing Plans for the I-10 and I-15 corridors and followed it by presenting the comparison funding sources of Public versus P3 Financing options. This was followed by the Value for Money Analysis which stated:

- Purpose of the value for money analysis is to provide a financial comparison of delivery models – Public vs. P3
- The value for money analysis compares project expenditures and net revenues anticipated for both a public and P3 delivery
- There are no differences in capital or operating costs between the public and P3 delivery

Following the Value for Money results, Mr. Hoshijima presented the Public Finance Pros and Cons which were the following:

Pros

- Retain control over setting toll rates
- Public “System” Enterprise:
 - Set toll rates on a regional basis as opposed to single project considerations
 - Provides funding for future projects

Cons

- Retain toll revenue risk
- Requires additional Measure I upfront

Mr. Hoshijima concluded his presentation by presenting the key findings to his analysis which are: the I-10 and I-15 are financially feasible and the public finance option provides much more upside than the P3 model.

The following questions were asked at the end of Mr. Hoshijima’s presentation:

- Valerie Henry: Is the toll revenue over 30 years? *Craig Hoshijima: It’s over 50 years but SANBAG’s portion would vary with options.*
- Matthew Slowik: Looking at the two charts on discount rates, so the publically financed scenario is better than the private scenario? *Craig Hoshijima: Yes, since SANBAG retains a significantly higher amount of revenue than with private financing.*
- Phillip Cothran: Does San Bernardino have the money to invest or is the money somewhere else? *Craig Hoshijima: The figures illustrate the source of funding, which is a combination of loans and bonding.*
- William Waddingham: What is the life on the freeway? *Garry Cohoe: The life on a freeway is designed for 50 years but we get more out of some as you may know.*
- William Waddingham: Worst case scenario with an earthquake, where does the money come from? *Craig Hoshijima: Assuming the question pertains to the cost of repair, it would be allocated to either SANBAG/Caltrans*

or the Private Operator. Allocation would depend on the timing of the earthquake (during construction, post construction, etc.) and the terms of the contract.

- Matthew Slowik: From the State’s standpoint, tolls and fees are defined differently. *Craig Hoshijima: Correct.*

IX. Summary, Presented by Garry Cohoe, SANBAG

Mr. Cohoe providing a recap of the key issues which were:

- Resources are not available to build our way out of congestion
- R/W for only 2 more lanes
- Financial studies have found that there are not adequate projected funds to build the needed improvements:
 - One lane each direction on I-10
 - No lanes on I-15
- Optimize the resources by implementing traffic management

Additionally Mr. Cohoe recapped by stating Express Lanes would provide a reliable high speed option which is sustainable for the long term. He also stated that both corridors are financially feasible and the public finance option would provide a higher value for money than the P3 option and would keep control of the facilities in the public’s hands.

Mr. Cohoe provided the next steps which included requesting direction on the project from the SANBAG board in December 2013.

The following question was asked at the end of Mr. Cohoe’s presentation:

- Arnold San Miguel: Might the board decision on this project be postponed to January 2014? *Garry Cohoe: We are still scheduled for December 2013.*

X. Public Outreach Update – Presented by Jason Lombard, Lee Andrews Group

Mr. Lombard began by announcing and thanking the CAG for identifying the following briefings: 1) Victorville Chamber of Commerce, October 10th, 2) Fontana Chamber of Commerce, October 16th, 3) Apple Valley Chamber of Commerce, November 20th, Rotary Club of Fontana, October 21st and City of Fontana Council, November 26th.

Mr. Lombard reported that the project website (www.i10corridorproject.org) has been viewed 1000 times and that the Facebook page has over 89 “Likes”. Mr. Lombard encouraged the CAG to continue sharing the project website, Facebook page and SANBAG Twitter.

Mr. Lombard asked that the CAG to review, share/collect input from affiliated groups on the findings presented on Equity, Traffic & Revenue and Financial Analysis. He added that the CAGs would be contacted by the outreach team to request feedback and comments collected from affiliated groups.

Mr. Lombard announced the following schedule for CAG Meetings #5:

- EV CAG – Tuesday, November 19th at Gonzalez Community Center, Colton
- HD CAG – Wednesday, November 20th at Victorville City Hall, Victorville
- WV CAG – Thursday, November 21st – Location TBD

XI. Action Items for CAG members (to be conducted prior to CAG Meeting #5)

- Provide updates to affiliated groups – share information presented at CAG Meeting #4 and seek input.
- Email feedback and comments received to SANBAG@leeandrewsgroup.com.
- Identify briefings opportunities for SANBAG.
- Encourage people to visit the Project Website
- Recruit people to “Like” our Facebook page and to “Follow” us on Twitter (@SANBAGnews)

XII. Additional Questions and Comments.

None.

Project Material Distributed

The following Project materials were provided to each CAG Member in attendance:

- Meeting Agenda
- Comment Card
- CAG Meeting #4 PowerPoint presentation copy
- Updated I-15 Corridor Project Fact Sheet (English and Spanish)
- I-10 Corridor Project Fact Sheet (English and Spanish)
- Copies of the Board Workshop binder information and presentation were available upon request.

Next CAG Meeting

- *WV CAG Meeting #5* will be held on Thursday, November 21, 2013 at 6:00 PM – Location to be determined. CAG Members will receive updates and additional meeting details via email.
 - CAG Members with scheduling conflicts are welcome to attend any of the other meetings as long as they provide advance notice of which other meeting they plan to attend in lieu of their assigned CAG meeting.